



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/720,277	03/12/2001	Clifford L. Hannel	INTDYN01.017	9408

25247 7590 10/25/2005

GORDON E NELSON
PATENT ATTORNEY, PC
57 CENTRAL ST
PO BOX 782
ROWLEY, MA 01969

EXAMINER

VU, THONG H

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2142

DATE MAILED: 10/25/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/720,277

Applicant(s)

HANNEL ET AL.

Examiner

Thong H. Vu

Art Unit

2142

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 August 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

1. Amended claims 1-12 and new claim 13 are pending.
2. This application claims the priority of 6/29/1998.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-13 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. Claims 8,10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention (i.e.: a further condition **may be** associated in the database with the given policy). It was unclear what includes and excludes condition in database with the given policy.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

- Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schneider et al [Schneider, 6,678,835 B1] in view of Reid et al [Reid, 6,182,226 B1].
5. As per claim 1, Schneider discloses A policy enforcement system for enforcing policies defining what actions belonging to a first type thereof first entities defined in a computer system may perform on second entities defined in the computer system

[Schneider, VPN, abstract], the policy enforcement system being of the type that includes

a policy server including a policy database of the policies [Schneider, firewall or access filter, col 2 lines 50-65; distributed Policy Database, Fig 3, col 9 lines 34-col 12 line 52]; and

However Schneider does not explicitly detail

a policy enforcer that controls performance of the first type of action and is capable of communicating a request to perform an action of the first type to the policy server, the policy enforcer permitting performance of the action only if a response from the policy server indicates that the policies permit the action and the policy enforcement system being characterized in that:

the policy database is extensible to include policies for actions belonging to an additional type thereof and the policy enforcement system is thereby extensible to include, an additional policy enforcer which controls performance of actions of the additional type.

In the same endeavor, Reid discloses a firewall or the enforces policy server includes policy database on VPN provides type enforcement enforces the least privilege concept by controlling all the interaction between domains and file types, specific file types of other domains [Reid, col 3 lines 27-40]

Therefore it would have been obvious to an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the policy enforcer permitting the interaction with the additional type of other domains as taught by Reid into the Schneider's apparatus in

order to utilize the access filters and policy database. Doing so would provide the controlling interaction between networks by the use of firewalls with defined regions [Reid, col 1 lines 53-55]

6. Claims 8, 10 contain the similar limitations set forth in claim 1. Therefore claims 8,10 are rejected for the same rationale set forth in claim 1.

7. As per claim 2, Schneider-Reid disclose the policy database is of the class wherein policies are defined in terms of sets of the first entities and sets of the second entities and the policy database is further extensible to include an additional type of the first entities and/or an additional type of the second entities [Reid, other domains, col 3 lines 27-40].

8. As per claim 3, Schneider-Reid disclose an action attribute may be associated in the database with a set of the first entities and/or a set of the second entities, the action attribute specifying a manner in which an action specified in a given policy is to be performed as regards entities in the set of first entities and/or entities in the set of second entities [Schneider, the distributed Policy Database, Fig 3, col 9 lines 34-col 12 line 52].

9. As per claim 4, Schneider-Reid disclose the database is further extensible to include an additional type of action attributes [Schneider, attributes, col 7 lines 1-3].

10. As per claim 5, Schneider-Reid disclose the additional policy enforcer controls performance of actions at a level of the computer system which is different from that at which the policy enforcer controls performance of actions [Reid, col 3 lines 27-40].

11. As per claim 6, Schneider-Reid disclose at least one of the policy enforcers is at a location in the computer system that is remote from the policy server [Reid, Internet, Fig 1].

12. As per claim 7, Schneider-Reid disclose the policy enforcer controls a second entity that is not part of the computer system [Reid, other domains, col 3 lines 27-40].

13. As per claim 9, Schneider-Reid disclose the further condition is a time interval specification associated with the given policy, the time interval specification specifying an interval of time during which entities belonging to the given set of first entities specified in the given policy may perform the given action specified therein on entities belonging to the given set of second entities specified therein [Schneider, a period of time, col 40 lines 60-65].

14. As per claim 11, Schneider-Reid disclose the database is extensible to include new types of action attributes [Schneider, attributes, col 7 lines 1-3; extended from the access filter, col 18 lines 22-40].

15. As per claim 12, Schneider-Reid disclose an action attribute condition may be associated in the database with an action attribute for the given policy, the action attribute condition determining whether a requesting entity belonging to the given set of first entities can perform the given action as specified in the action attribute on an entity in the given set of second entities at the time the requesting entity makes the request [Schneider, a period of time, col 40 lines 60-65].

16. As per claim 13, Schneider-Reid disclose the additional type of action is defined by a user of the policy enforcement system; and the policy enforcement system includes a user interface for extending the policy database by adding the user-defined additional type of action thereto [Schneider, define policies, col 24 lines 32-55, Fig 11].

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to examiner *Thong Vu*, whose telephone number is (571)-272-3904. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 6:00AM-3:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, *Andrew Caldwell*, can be reached at (571) 272-3868. The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PMR or Public PMR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Thong Vu
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2142

